THE

"HINDU MESSAGE"

A Weekly Review of Indian and World-Problems from the Hindu Standpoint.

Editors: K Sundararama Aiyar M.A., & T. K. Balasubrahmanya Aiyar B.A.

VOL. 1.] THURSDAY APRIL 4, 1918. [No. 24.

The **Hindu Message** stands for

(1) The Maintenance of British supremacy with self-government for India,

(2) Co-operation with the different communities of India without prejudice to Hindu Dharma,

(3) Education of the Hindus as an integral part of the Indian Nation,

(4) Advancement of Material prosperity on a spiritual basis and

(5) Dissemination of pure Hindu Culture.

Annual Subscription Rs. 6 only.

For *bona fide* students Rs. 3 only.

Single copy As. 2 only.

All business communications and remittances to be addressed to the Manager and all literary contributions and books for Review to be addressed to the Editor, THE HINDU MESSAGE, ***Srirangam.***

A Vision Of India.

THE GANGA—X.

By K. S. Ramaswami Sastri, B.A., B.L.

From that great Jahnu's Asram forward sped
Thy waters white to meet the ocean blue,
Attended by Queen Jumna fair to view
And bright Saraswathi's sweet maidenhead
Which from day's prying eyes retreating fled
Beneath the earth where as the rose the dew
It sweetens life unseen but well and true
By nectar-touch from its ambrosical bed.
The Sagaras were purified by thee.
O save our joyless souls by sin beguiled
By gracious touch of thy sweet waters white!
Bhagirathi! O sweet Mandakini!
Alakananda bright! Great Jahnu's child!
O Vishnu's grace! Siva's crest-jewel bright!

The Hindu Message

THURSDAY EVENING 4, APRIL, 1918.

The Viceroy's Speech Closing the Session.

All India will appreciate the candour and fairness of His Excellency's speech closing the spring session of the Imperial Legislature at Delhi on the 22nd March last. As this is "primarily the financial session," as he called it, His Excellency devoted it mainly to matters of finance. The War Loan issued last year to meet the 150 crores which "India promised to His Majesty's Government for the cost of the War" was not fully subscribed. Only 52 crores were subscribed. As regards the remaining 98 crores, His Excellency said that "India has assumed responsibility for interest charges and repayment of a corresponding amount of the British War Loan." India is fully aware of the advantages of raising the loan in India. The money will be spent in India in raising various articles required for the War and will thus benefit Indian cultivators and producers. The value of these commodities will go to extinguish the remaining debt of 98 crores, and the interest now paid on that amount will be paid to those persons in India who subscribe for the New War Loan to be raised this year here to cover that debt. Lastly, the more money is raised here by the loan, the more will it enable the Government to reduce its necessity to put additional coins and notes into circulation. His Excellency said :—"Each rupee subscribed will reduce either the amount of new silver that we have to purchase or else help to strengthen the metallic portion of our paper curency reserve."

Notwithstanding these evident advantages, the response to the Government's War Loan was last year only partially successful, and we have grave doubts whether the new loan to be started this year will be a greater success. His Excellency said :—"I confidently trust that India will once more rise to the occasion and equal, if not surpass, her previous effort." That India is as much interested in the crushing of the enemy as any other part of the Empire has already been proved in various ways,—and chiefly by the vast sums already subscribed, or still being subscribed as War Gifts by her princes and people in all parts of the country. That the sacrifices of men and money made on the battle-fields of Europe and Asia may, in one sense, be regarded as not voluntary, because it is made in obedience to the commands of authority, is a view which may be held by some people; and we have actually heard of some statements to that effect made in certain irresponsible quarters But we do not think that the civilised man's cultivated sense of responsibility,—the working in him of the perfect law of duty which is also the perfect law of liberty—is effaced in the Indian's mind only, simply because the Indian (like others) receives payment for the services rendered and sacrifices made, by him on the battle-field. Apart, however, from these services and sacrifices, we have the vast amount of voluntary help of all kinds rendered by the Indian peoples and princes, and they show clearly our sense of the stake we have in this war.

Our unquestioned sense of the value of our place in the Empire was fully also brought into play in the spirit in which we made our response to the Government when it issued the last year's War Loan. That the same spirit will always prevail in India can no longer be questioned by any Imperialist at least,—by any one who is anxious to promote the unity and the strength of the Empire as the greatest instrument existing to promote the cause of righteousness among men. Still, it is a notorious fact that India's resources are not at all in keeping with her appreciation of her position and responsibilities within the Empire, and it is her serious deficiency in this respect that is the real explanation of her inability to make a larger response last year than she actually did to the Government's War Loan.

We fear that His Excellency the Viceroy has but an imperfect appreciation of this fact. For, he spoke of the starting of "unofficial propagandist committees" for the purpose of conveying to the Indian populace the urgency of the need for making an ampler response than was made last year to the War Loan about to be issued now. He said:—"We want propagandist work, and the more unofficial that work the more satisfactory will be its results."

We shall certainly rejoice, if the results secured prove a satisfactory advance on those gained last year. We trust that our people will come forward eagerly and gladly as subsvribers to the New Loan, and that every Indian will join—or even convert himself into—a "propagandist committee" for the purpose of advancing the cause. His Excellency informs us that he is "against the employment of undue pressure to constrain unwilling people to subscribe to the loan." We feel that nowhere in the land can there be found any individuals or group of men who can be truly spoken of as "unwilling people." All are willing to come forward and subscribe their utmost, but we must not fail to take into account the well-known and well-established fact that nearly one-half of the population of India are ever on the verge of starvation.

The entire country will cheerfully and gladly associate itself with the tribute which His Excellency paid to Sir W. Meyer for the services he has rendered to India as its Finance Minister. He has held this great office in a time of abnormal difficulty and strain, and has met to the full all the immense and extraordinary military demands of the period. His skill has been so conspicuous that the demands on account of the war expenditure will be met entirely from the great increase of receipts expected undr various revenue estimates during the coming year, and without any additional taxation. This circumstance alone is enough to entitle him to the gratitude of the country. Moreover, Sir W. Meyer has also taken his share of the burden of the ordinary work of the Executive Council of the Government of India, and he has also been Chairman of the Recruiting Board. In his case and in that of all other Government Officers, the whole country will cheerfully respond to His Excellency's call that "criticism should be tempered by charitableness." No doubt the country, as a whole, has always expressed a strong dislike of the present bureaucratic system of governing India by the Indian Civil

Service organisation. But it is also true that it is among our Civil Service bureaucrats that we have found our greatest benefactors and friends—men like A. O, Hume, Sir William Wedderburn, and Sir Henry Cotton. Hence, while we strongly condemn the system of government, we shall not be found wanting in due appreciation when men exceptionally meritorious in well-doing are found in the ranks of the Indian bureaucracy. His Excellency's tribute of praise to Sir William Meyer will find a responsive echo in all Indian hearts, and we trust that he will long be spared to enjoy in a happy retirement the well-earned honours and rewards of his great Indian career.

Self-Determination and Social Service.

The Western or civilised world is after all learning the lesson that it is not good for one people to interfere with the political, economic, and social organisation and ideals of other people and communities. This is the essence of the principle of *self-determination*, now proclaimed by Dr. Wilson, the great and wise President of the United States,—the holder of a position as dignified and powerful as any ever occupied by any human being in the modern world, whether a crowned head or not. This is also the principle of *Svadharma* which was first proclaimed by Sri Krishna on the banks of the Sarasvati river in ancient India. It was strictly and thoroughly applied to every man, every sub-caste, caste, and the entire fabric of society in ancient India, and it is the shattered remnant of the society founded on that principle that is now being shaken to its depths and foundations by the introduction and influence of the contrary principle of the Western world,—viz., the right of one people to disturb the constitution of others and impose its own on them. The occasion for self-examination with the result of enabling European thinkers to appreciate the blessing of the principle of self-determination has arisen with the growth of Germany's power and ambitions and as a consequence of the vigour and success with which it has prosecuted its war of aggression in Europe during well-nigh four years past. It is now that thinking minds in Europe are beginning to comprehend the full moral significance of this great world-strife. Principal L. P. Jacks writes in "Land and Water":—"What is wrong with Germany is simply that she has never learnt to mind her own business and leave other nations to mind theirs. She claims the right to impose her own culture on the rest of the world, without consulting it." But this is exactly what European nations have been doing during the last three or four centuries and more. The success—financial, territorial, and other—which attended their aggression in Asia blinded them to the evils and wrongs which they inflicted on others by the destruction of their own "*self-determined*" social organisation and constitution. But the circumstances of to-day have to some extent enabled them to see the grievous error of their courses and principles. For, Germany has, after strengthening her national organisation and unity, determined to apply to the peoples and nations of Europe their own principles of external interference and aggression. For many years past, Germany had at-

tempted to win for herself an Empire consisting of Colonies and Dependencies outside Europe. Germany was resolved to make up for lost time and wanted to achieve in a hurry what other European nations had accomplished slowly,—the building-up of a great World-Empire. When she found, or imagined, herself thwarted by those who had already won Empires for themselves, she became impatient and discovered that her only alternative was to Germanise Europe,—to impose her own dominion and culture on Europe, as the essential and indispensable preliminary to the achievement of a world-wide Imperial dominion which would place her in a position—if not of dominance—at least similar to that achieved by other Western nations.

It is the aggression and advance of Germany in her attempt "to impose her own culture"—and her dominion also, if possible—on Europe that has brought prominently to men's minds the benefits of the opposing principle of "self-determination,"—what Indians calls *Svadharma.* Principal Jacks says in the article already referred to:—"Germany has never learnt to mind her own business and to leave other nations to mind theirs." He then begins to speculate as follows:—"One often wonders what the world would be like at the present moment if civilisation had been grounded from the first on the law of 'minding ones own business' with less said about doing good to others." He arrives at the following conclusion:—"There might not be so much wealth in the world, but what there was would be worth far more. We should be doing each other more good than we can ever hope to do by all that is commonly comprised under social service." And again:—"There would be less idleness, less inefficiency, less ugliness, less dirt, less shoddy, and, above all, less humbug—less, in short, of every thing which darkens the future of the earth."

That these were exactly the considerations which led the Indian world-teacher to enunciate the principle of *Svadharma* (or self-determination) we may not be in a position to prove. But the acceptance of the modern principle of "social service" to the neglect of the principle of "minding one's own business" has already had one effect in India,—viz., that of inducing her to resolve on embarking on a policy of advance on lines similar to those which have commended themselves to European nations in the past three or four centuries and which they have pursued with special persistency and emphasis during the second half of the nineteenth century and in the present century since its commencement. The Indian people have practically abandoned the individualistic people of "minding one's own business," and everywhere we see men bent on "social service." India is, first, resolved on using this principle to secure self-government, after abolishing the present bureaucratic form of government, or at least by depriving it of its power for mischief. But when this has been achieved, no one can set limits to her possibilities of advance as an integral part of the British Empire.

"Social service" and "doing good to others"—both terms being regarded as synonymous by Principal Jacks—are, it seems, mere euphemistic equivalents for what is known as systematic and determined aggression, the destruction or demoralisation of other

communities, or both. We have the process of destruction in its nakedness when one community forcibly terminates the political and economic organisation of another. Demoralisation takes place when a new system of education is set up whose tendency is to discredit the ethical and spiritual sources of the existing civilisation and to set forth the value and uses of the new social and political order in the most attractive light possible. Conquering and growing nations, in their intercourse with the rest of the world, have resorted to both these processes in order to pave the way for their own advance. Germany is now striving to apply these processes—the principles of "social service" or doing good to others, in both of its aspects—to Europe itself, instead of applying them, as hitherto they have been, to peoples outside Europe. Japan has already taken a leaf out of the book of sage counsels taught to her by Europe. India has evidently also begun to take her first lessons in the principle or policy of rendering "social service" and "doing good to others." She is evidently determined no longer "to mind her own business." We have, in abundance, Indian statesmen, speakers, writers, journalists, heroes of the hour, men of the moment, Mahatmas, Lokamanyas, Lokamatas, reformers, &c., in abundance who, we suppose, will unrestingly labour till she has made full amends for her failures in the past.

THE HINDU MESSAGE will be posted regularly every week to any address in India, Burma and Ceylon on payment of Rs. 6 only per annum; For all foreign countries within the Postal Union it will be despatched on payment of 10s. 6d. per annum. All subscriptions are payable in advance and should be remitted to the Manager. "*The Hindu Message*", Srirangam.

Notes and Comments.

We shall to-day pursue further our criticism of the Revd. Mr. Underwood's strange hallucinations and misapprehensions regarding our Advaita doctrine of Vedanta. He proposes to overthrow it "by an appeal to the facts and findings of the enlightened moral consciousness," and proceeds to speak of what he calls "the experience of remorse." He says:—"Remorse has no meaning unless it testifies to the existence of something which ought not to exist. And if something exists which ought not to exist, then pantheism as a system is finally and for ever destroyed. And remorse does so testify or is an illusion. There is nothing in existence but God." Our reply is that remorse is a fact of human experience. To whom? Remorse is also an illusion. To whom? The answer to these questions is as follows. Not to the same person at the same stage of spiritual development, but either to different persons in different stages of such development, or to the same person in different stages of his spiritual development. Is it not a fact of daily experience that the same thing is at the same time both a reality and not a reality,—but to different persons. A piece of mother-of-pearl lying on the ground is seen as it truly is by one person, but is at the same time seen as silver by another. The illusion which leads to its being mistaken as silver exists only for the latter not for the former. Similarly, to the man who has realised that there is nothing but God," remorse like any other phenomenal experience, is but an illusion,—not to the man for whom "it makes life a pain and agony."—

***

The Revd. Mr. Underwood must now see that to the Hindu Vedantin (or Pantheist, as he calls him) the unity of existence is not a mere metaphysical concept, but the same as *experience* or *consciousness as such*, transcending all ordinary and phenomenal cognition of duality or difference in the world. He is, therefore, speaking of the latter, viz., the phenomenal world, when he says that "the affirmations of the moral consciousness are

the most real thing we know, nearer to us, more important to us, and more imperious in their claims than the philosophic demand for unity." The "One only without a second" of the Vedantin does not originate as a datum of consciousness in a merely theoretical "philosophic demand for unity," but is the one reality or existence, the noumenal consciousness, Self (or *Chit*), of the living man which, when the mind is dissolved in Yoga, transcends the phenomenal world of matter. Until one has reached this *transcendental* cognition of the Self, the "affirmations of moral consciousness are the most real thing we know," but not afterwards. It is therefore, absurd to say of Vedantic Pantheism, as Mr. Underwood does, that "as a system it is easily reducible to iniquity," The call of morality remains imperative so long as this transcendental realisation of the Self is not reached, but ceases after such realisation takes place, for to him who has scaled its heights and depths the world of phenomena ceases,—even as the false perception of silver ceases when the object mistaken as silver is seen in its true nature as mother-of-pearl. Mr. Underwood says:—"If pantheism says that we have no sin, it deceives itself, and the truth is not in it" Pantheism does not say that there is no sin, but there is a stage of perfection,—the soul of man as soul, beyond all duality, beyond the contrasts of virtue and vice, pleasure and pain, cold and heat, &c.,—when the living soul is freed from all sin and realises its identity with the One Self or consciousness which is the noumenal Reality. The soul as soul is perfect and sinless,—it is sinful only when it associates or identifies with the mind, body, and other material objects.

***

The Revd. Mr. Underwood speaks of what he knows not about when he says that, in Hinduism, "a man's highest duty is to obey the rules of his caste" and that "the great defect of the caste system is that it is essentially a system of group morality." The Hindu Dharma (or system of ethics) makes a two-fold distinction in the rules of morality,—the *Samanya-Dharma* or the universal moral rules binding on all,, such as truth, justice, love, kindness, mercy, charity, &c., and the *Visesha-Dharma* or rules binding only on the members of each caste. Hence it has got *both* a set of universal rules of ethics and a set of rules applying to each group or caste. Hence Mr. Underwood is wrong when he says of the Hindu that his moral duties must *always* be looked upon from the point of view of the group to which he belongs." Every Hindu has to observe both sets of rules. This elementary principle of Hinduism overthrows in its entirety the three long paragraphs of eloquent nonsense (p. 3) in which Mr. Underwood draws upon the resources of a perverted imagination in order to prove that the Hindu system of ethics denies the supremacy of conscience and freedom.

***

The Revd. Mr. Underwood's criticism of the Hindu doctrine of Karma proves as great a failure and delusion as his criticism of Vedantic Monism. His first objection is stated as follows:—"The ethics of the Karma doctrine are imperfect because it teaches that good action binds a man no less securely to the wheel of birth than does wrong action. The doctrine fails to draw a distinction, which is vital, between good action and bad action." This criticism shows that Mr. Underwood, like other christian missionaries, speaks about things of which he knows little or nothing. The doctrine of Karma makes the must emphatic distinction between right and wrong action, and between the desire which leads to right action and the desire which leads to wrong action. Of course it holds also that right actions and desires bind no less than wrong ones. Mr. Underwood says that this shows "a clear failure of ethical insight." Not at all. For, in the *first* place, we hold that as all fetters must bind, whether they are made of gold or of steel, so all actions based on desire must bind, whether they lead to good or bad results. In the *second* place, we make a distinction in right desires and activities,—(*a*) those leading to *abhudaya*, the transient joys of this or higher worlds; and (*b*) those leading to *nisreyasa*, the eternal happiness arising from the gaining of the

knowledge of God which leads to *Mukti*, the soul's freedom. This kind of right desire and the activities arising from it are not of a *binding* character, and so are not objected to. A Christian Missionary ought to know this fundamental distinction which is made by Hinduism in right desires and activities before he ventures to set up as a critic of it.

We will offer further criticisms in our next issues regarding Mr. Underwood's misapprehensions of our doctrine of Karma.

Olla Podrida.

Will you permit me to say a few words as to the scope of these scattered *obiter dicta* these *disjecta membra*, these little bits of fun, frolic, and fancy? The scope has been indicated already in these words. So not a word more. *They also serve who only stand and laugh* ! ! !

* * *

So Mr. Justice Seshagiri Iyer presides over the display (?) of the Indian Boy Scouts on 5th April 1918, at 5 P.M. *New India* will not be angry with him any longer, and we leave a happy sigh of relief.

* * *

Ahmednagar has painted walls for the sake of national education. For the same cause the Palghat Tile Works give—what?

* * *

It seems that recently H. E. the Governor of Madras inspected some old buildings to decide if they could be converted into a club for Indian students. This is the comment of Mr. G. A. on this: "I am quite aware that some of us, who are soldiers in the army of freedom, are considered to have a pernicious influence upon the student population, so I am not surprised that an effort should be made *to tempt the Young men of Madras to forsake their friends*. It remains to be seen of course whether this new movement succeeds." See the *New India* dated 23-3-18. So it is all a case of wooing the soul of Young India—for the sake of exclusive possession, is it! The precious soul of Young India already dead to all sense of maidenly reserve by too much public exhibition says in the spirit of the hero of the Beggar's Opera.

"How happy could I be with either
If the other dear charmer were away!!!

* * *

It is now settled that there is to be a National Education Week every year and there will thus be a sort of self-imposed supertax for heaven knows what ! ! !

* * *

The *Lucknow Advocate* speaks of "her work for Theosophy which has a great future before it and which will bring ultimate salvation for suffering humanity." Hallelujah! Glory to the highest! For after all the world has been saved!

* * *

So the Concert of apprentices at law has come and gone, and the concord of sweet sounds of all shades and varieties of sweetness has passed into the region of silence. What is the reward for it all? When H. R. comes Mr. G. S. A. will get all of them made judges—I hope not judges of music.

* * *

At the All-India Depressed Classes Mission Conference held on the 23rd and 24th March at Bombay H. H. the Gaekwar of Baroda who was the President of the Conference was good enough to refer to the depressed classes as *Adi Sudras*. This does credit to His Highness's statesmanship but not to his scholarship. What is the meaning of *Adi Sudras*? Does it mean that those called by that name now were once upon a time *Sudras*—or rather Non-Brahmanas (I beg pardon for using the word Sudras)? Does it mean that they were so at the beginning? Very likely His Highness was present at the beginning of things. Perhaps he was present not really but rhetorically then. He suggests that all public institutions should be thrown open to them. No one seems to take up in a practical form the humble but useful work of building temples for them finding for them steady work and wages, and building suitable dwelling houses for them. But all this will only effect silent improvement. But what we want is not silent improvement but noisy declamation leading to social friction. Another supposed great leader is said to have remarked that there

is no warrant in the Hindu sastras for untouchability. Naturally so, because the Hindu sastras are the only untouched and untouchables in this land now. What is contained in them is not read but talked about by people who have not read them to people who do not want to read them.

***

Mr. G. Annaji Row has tried to haul me over the coals in the issue of *New India* dated 29th March 1918. But I find that I am as yet unsinged by the coals. He seems to be as good a master of superlatives as his master, and in his masterpiece of attempted humour are strewn with careless prodigality such phrases as "rare treat", "sparkling wit", "stirring enthusiasm", etc. etc. Let him worship the gods of his admiration by all means !!

***

Let us not forget that India will live even after 7th April 1918.

SCRUTATOR.

Hindu Society

Under Vikramaditya VI, the Chalukyan (1031—1126)

(BY A. V. VENKATARAMA AIYAR, M.A.)

C.—Administrative.

At the head of the State was, of course, the Maharaja who had a large number of *birudas*. The Chalukya sovereigns styled themselves Maharajadhiraja, Paramesvara and Paramabhattaraka and had, besides, one or another of the various *malla* titles—such as A'havamalla, Trailokyamalla, Jagadekamalla, Bhuvanaikamalla or Tribuvanamalla. The Maharaja was the fountain of all power—civil, military and religious. His office was hereditary and it was filled up only by members of the royal family. Within the royal circle, however, there was a great latitude in selection which was influenced more by considerations of efficiency and fitness rather than mere priority of birth or primogeniture. A strong grown-up brother was in most cases preferred to a weak and immature son. An element of divinity always hedged an oriental monarch. In theory he was absolute and irresponsible, yet in practice there were some moral limitations on his absolutism. If he was virtuously disposed there was always the fear of God above and if very despotic there was the danger of a popular rising or insurrection. There was always an assembly of *Mahápradáns* (a council of ministers) presided over by a *Sarvádikári* who corresponded more or less to the modern prime-minister. The king was expected to ask the advice of this assembly and even to follow it in most cases. In theory this was merely a consultative body the decisions of which were not legally binding on him. Yet in practice he deferred to its opinions. Thus the monarch, though absolute and irresponsible in theory, was not always despotic necessarily in practice.

Some years after his accession the Maharaja used to nominate the Yuvaraja. Like the Cæsar of Imperial Rome the Yuvaraja was the presumptive successor to the throne or heir-apparent. The designation of one as Yuvaraja was always considered to be a great public function to be performed with the knowledge of the subjects and in the presence of the ministers. There were certain religious ceremonies such as fasting, ablutions in the sacrificial fire (*homam*), etc., before one was invested with the dignity. The Yuvaraja was chosen from among the royal circle. It did not come by right to the eldest son but it was more or less customary to nominate him to the post in the majority of cases. There were two motives in thus associating some one with the government. The sovereign might, as the Yuvaraja came of age, delegate more and more of his arduous public functions to his more youthful associate and eventually resign the cares of sovereignty and seek repose and tranquillity in a life of solitude and contemplation in his last years, as was the ideal among Eastern monarchs. Secondly the would-be successor to the throne would become practically initiated into all the mysteries of state-craft so that when the turn came for him to rule independently he would ere long have been enabled to administer the affairs of the realm fairly and to continue the traditions of the family. In hereditary monarchies there is always a great deal of the personal element on which the weal or woe of the subjects so largely depends and, as Dr. Mommsen has observed, "of all haphazards, none is more hazardous than that of a hereditary monarchy." The appointment of Yuvaraja was an effective safe-guard against this risk and

went a long way towards mitigating the evils of pure hereditary monarchies in general.

'The king always maintained a body of dauntless champions to the number of several hundreds.' In addition, his numerous feudatories were also bound to supply him with men and money whenever they were called upon to do so. It was on his standing army and feudal levy that he relied mainly for his victories. The army was divided into many sections whose chiefs were known as *Mahasamantas.* They had a superior over them called *Mahasamantadhipati.* Besides these military officials there was an officer for peace and war (*Samdhivigrahin*) to control and guide the army administration as a whole. The Indian army consisted of three divisions—the elephants, cavalry and infantry. The elephants were arranged in front, the cavalry on the wings or in the centre and the infantry at the rear. The weapons of war used by the Chalukyas were swords, spears, javelins, bows and arrows. The 'shower of their straight arrows'—which reminds us of the long bows of the English in the Hundred Years' War more than two centuries later—and the 'sharp edge of their spears' often led the Chalukyas to many a victory. 'Each time the soldiers prepared for war they drank wine to intoxicate themselves and then one of these men would defy ten thousand enemies. Besides, they intoxicated many thousands of naturally fierce elephants. At the time of their coming to blows they drank strong liquor and ran in a body trampling everything under their feet. No enemy could stand before them.' The wives of kings as well as of soldiers accompanied their husbands to the battle field. The Chalukyas had a curious but very exemplary way of punishing a cowardly general. 'When a general lost a battle, instead of punishing him corporally they made him wear women's clothes.'

The monarchs of the eleventh century were truly chivalrous in an eminent degree and, like the Celts of old, loved nothing so much as personal combat. 'If any one insult them they would risk their lives to wipe out that affront.' We have two striking examples confirming their high sense of personal honour. When A'havamalla heard that Rajadhiraja, the Chola king, penetrated far into his dominions and slaughtered many of his subjects he exclaimed 'This is a disgrace to me,' rode on a single *mast* elephant and slew him with his own hand. Again, after the defeat at Kudal in the days of Virarajendra A'havamalla became troubled in mind, thought it much better to die than to live in disgrace and at once wrote an autograph letter challenging him to meet him once more at the same place on a day appointed for the purpose. One must read the autograph letter to be impressed with the depth of the bitter feeling experienced by its author at his defeat, which reflects his high sense of honour and chivalry, (though through circumstances far beyond his control the challenger himself was unable to meet the challenged). The standard of international morality was no less lofty. 'Whenever they had an injury to avenge they never failed to give warning to their enemy.' The instance cited above is one in point. 'In battle they pursued the fugitives but never slew those who gave themselves up' Pillage or plunder for its own sake, slaughter of innocent women, children and Brahmans, taking girls to wife and destruction of castes were all considered to be heinous deviations from the canons of international understanding of the times and this is well echoed in the Hottur inscription of Satyasraya where his Chola contemporary Rajaraja the Great is said to have deviated from these conventions. The chivalrous A'havamalla mocks partly in disgust and partly in anger at the actions of Rajadhiraja when he heard that he had destroyed his towns and cities and had ruined his rivers. The office of herald and messenger was always held in high esteem, *e.g.*, the messenger of Virarajendra was treated with due courtesy by Vikramaditya though sent by his bitterest foe. Bilhana tells us that Vikramaditya took possession of everything in Kanchi except temples and flags, from which it could be inferred that these were exempt from seizure. Deservedly therefore did the Chola that burnt the Jain temples in Beluvola earn the epithet 'wicked' in the inscription at Annigere that records the atrocious deed. There is not a single instance, either in their own or in their enemies' records, in which the reproach of the non-observance of international morals could be laid at the doors of Chalukya sovereigns.

The empire was divided for the purpose of administration into a number of *rashtras*

corresponding to the *mandalas* of the Cholas and to our own presidencies or provinces. Each *rashtra* was again split up into a large number of *vishayas*, equivalent to the Chola *nadus* and to our districts or taluks. Each *vishaya* was further sub-divided into a large number of *gramams* or villages. The heads of these various divisions were known respectively as *rashtrapati*, *vishayapati* and *gramakutak*. Besides these there is mention of *ayuktaka* and *niyuktaka* whose functions are not clear. The head of a *rashtra* was invariably a *mahadandanayaka*, *mahamandalesvara*, the chief of a *vishaya* or *nadu* was known as *nalgavunda* and *nurgavunda* or merely *gavunda*, and sometimes as *manneya*. The head of the village was an *urode* or *urgavunda*. The divisions of the empire were known by their numerical designations, *e.g.*, Gangapadi 96,000, Banavase 12,000 and Nolambapadi 32,000. Smaller divisions called such and such a seventy or fifty occur frequently in inscriptions. It seems probable that these figures denote the number of villages each division was composed of. Whenever a place had to be located reference was made to the *nadu* or *vishaya* and *rashtra* of which it formed successively a part. Thus Ponnavadi is said to be an *agrahara* in Page 50, which lay in a sub-circle or group of 600 towns, which in turn formed a part of Tardavadi 1,000 or *vishaya*: Halebid was a village in Kunda *vishaya* or *nadu*, part of the district of Gangapadi 96,000 *Khampana*.

The machinery of the central government consisted of a number of departments, each with an officer at its head. The assembly of *mahapradans* or the council of ministers certainly included these heads of departments. The division into deparments was not very rigid and it is not unusual for the head of one department to hold some minor or miscellaneous offices in connection with some other department. Thus Rupabhattayya, the great minister and treasurer, was also the superintendent of the guards of female departments, general superintendent, and *dandanayaka* in charge of *vaddaravula* and 18 *agraharas*. Therefore there seems to have been the combination of very many functions in spite of a general division of duties. The chief departments of the State were the army, justice, public works and the treasury. To look after the military affairs there was, as was already noted, an officer for peace and war (*Samdhivigrahin*). Justice was administered in accordance with the canons laid down in the *Mitakshara* of Vijnanesvara. We hear of a superintending engineer (*Sutradharitanakki*) in charge of public works. The most important department was, of course, the treasury and a well-replenished treasury was considered to be one of the seven requisite *angas* (conditions) of a well-ordered State. There were several ways of filling the treasury. The monarch of the 11th century realised a part of his revenue from *mameya* or seigniorage and from benevolences of free gifts. It was on land, however, that the lion's share of taxation fell. The adjustment and mode of realising the land revenue was the chief function of the civil government. There is reference in inscriptions to various kinds of lands—arable land, garden land, crop land, *guddemanya*, etc. The lands were divided into various classes according to their fertility and there seems to have been some fixed proportion in which the lands of different qualities were taxed. For watered lands of the best quality or wet lands with black soil the rate was higher than in other cases. The taxation varied according to the fertility of the soil and the amount of the crop realised. The lands free from rent were known as *umbali* lands. Besides the rent on lands, taxes were levied on houses, on marriage Pandals and even on the looking-glasses of dancing girls. There is mention of a tax named *kodena*, which perhaps was a sort of profession-tax on umbrella makers. As the administrator and sole proprietor of the whole realm the sovereign had rights to treasure-trove, underground stores, water-courses, stone-quarries, grain, gold, etc. A large portion of the annual revenue was realised from customs duties. The merchants of the time plied a busy trade and held markets and fairs to facilitate buying and selling. They trafficked not only in the necessaries of life but also in rare and luxurious commodities. On account of this large volume of trade of which there is unmistakable evidence in inscriptions the excise and transit duties always formed a highly profitable and lucrative source of the Crown's income, next only in importance and amount to the land revenue. There were two classes of customs. The heavy customs on important articles of

trade were known as the *hejjunka* or *perjjunka*. The duties on miscellaneous articles in which the transactions were small were known as the *kirukulasunka* and the transport duties on imports and exports, especielly on arecanut, betel, etc. were termed *bilkode*. There was a host of officials in charge of these various customs. Over and above them there were several managers of customs—*Sunkadhikarav*, *Sunkaman kaikondu nedeva*—and an accountant of the heavy customs (*Perjjunkada Kanikara*). The excise appears to have been farmed out or managed by an agent appointed by the Government. To look after the revenues accruing from sources other than customs there was a considerable number of revenue officials, *karanas* (karnams), *vadda-byahavaris* (senior merchants) in charge of *vaddâ-ravula* (principal taxes) and a chief of *karânas* (*Pramukha-karanum*). Over and above all these there was a chief treasurer (*Bhânddre*) in charge of all the receipts and expenditure. The annual expenditure always as a rule fell short of the income. A surplus or reserve was kept up year after year for emergent occasions such as war, drought, famine or pestilence or for expensive schemes of public welfare. Out of such surpluses accumulated for years, anicuts were thrown over rivers to prevent water from wastefully flowing into the sea; watersheds (*prapas*) were erected for wearied travellers; tanks were dug: large trunk-roads enabling big cars (*margali*) to move on and connecting the richer and poorer parts of the country for the advantage of the latter, medical dispensaries for the promotion of *dharma*, and *satrams* or hostels (*patasala*) for students (*brahmacharis*) were also put up.

The unit of the body politic and the basis of administration at all times was the Village Twelve, consisting of the headman, variously known as *maniagar*, *patel* or *gaudâ*, the *karnam* or *shanbhog* (the accountant), the *nigranti* to distribute water proportionally to the fields, the *talari*, the *toti*, the *jotishya* (astrolger) to predict auspicious or inauspicious times for sowing, ploughing, reaping, etc., the smith, the carpenter, the potter, the barber, the washerman and the village schoolmaster. The barber, washerman or potter was not paid by the times or number but each one's livelihood was secured to him in the form of a certain amount of paddy from each household. The compensation for his labour was not in money but in allotments of land from the common stock in some proportion. The village land was divide into three classes—arable, meadow and waste. The land that was not under cultivation was known as waste. If necessity should arise it could be brought under cultivation by any one on an application to the king who would grant the permission on payment of a nominal fee. The meadow was the common pasture for the cattle of the village. Each family had a portion of the arable land to itself according to its numbers. Mostly each occupant tilled his own land. The method of tillage was intensive rather than extensive except in the case of hill-tribes. The principle of rotation of crops was not unknown and the land was allowed to lie fallow once in a few years. Each man's holding consisted of a large number of small scattered acre or half-acre strips. These strips of land had names of their own, *e g*,, *doddanâmanya*, *goggalemanya*, etc., The strips of each were separated from those of his neighbour only by balks of unploughed turf, as is the practice even to this day. It was an 'open field' system and cattle were allowed to roam over after harvest was gathered in. 'The boundaries of each man's landed property were carefully maintained with as much jealousy and rancour as the frontiers of most potent kingdoms.' As Sir Henry Maine has observed, 'the village community of India exhibits resemblances to the Teutonic township which are much too strong and numerous to be accidental.' Justice was administered in the village by means of a *pânchayat* (a body of five honest folks) named by the parties in dispute and presided over by the village head who was at once the judge and commander of his village. India in the eleventh century knew not litigation nor the long train of lawyers. The inhabitants gave themselves no trouble about the breaking up and division of kingdoms and never looked beyond their own village. 'The interior constitution of each village remained unchanged; no revolutions affected it no conquests reached it. Conquests, usurpations or revolutions considered as such had absolutely no influence on its condition.' The whole frame of the interior management of the village remained unalterably the same. Every village was a kind

of republic and India was nothing but a series of such republics. Thus the government though centralised and absolute at the top was broad-based on pure democratic principles, justifying the worn-out maxim that 'it is democracy that is ancient and despotism that is new.'

Varna-Asrama-Dharma.

(The substance of two learned and inspiring lectures delivered by His Holiness Sri Sankaracharya Swamigal at Kumbakonam.)

Now coming to the internal Dharmas laid down for the followers of the three Varnas, it may be stated at the outset that each Varna has to pass through various *Samskaras* intended for the purification of the mind (*Chitta-Suddhi*), and that the *Adhikara* or *Capacity* for these is what distinguishes the three Varnas from the fourth or the Sudra Varna, These *Samskaras* or self-purificatory rites are generally set down as forty. Of these *Garbhadana* or the rite intended for the purification of the *Jiva*, while it is yet in the womb of the mother, in order to secure its spiritual advancement after its birth, is the first and prime *Samskara*. This is done by means of Mantras and connected rites. *Pumsavana*, *Seemanta-Unnayana*, *Jatakarma* at the birth of the child, *Namakarana*, and *Annaprasana* come in order of time. The next or the seventh *Samskara*, known as *Chaula*, takes place in the third year of the child. This is a rite which has great significance and is based on a specific principle in the structure of Varna-Asrama-Dharma. Very careful and specific injunctions are laid down for the *Samskara*, for it is the fundamental principle of Varna-Asrama-Dharma that *Sarira-Achara*, or *Bahya Achara* or the external mode of living, is very important and has great spiritual significance. The rule, for instance, that the followers of Three Rishis should have *Three Sikhas* and that the followers of Five Rishis should wear *Five Sikhas* until Upanayana, is very useful. as it leads to an immediate distinction between the two classes of people. In the matter of *Sarira-Achara*, the three most important to observe are *Sikha* (the hair), *Pundra* (the mark on the forehead) and *Sutra* (the leading Rishi in matters of ceremonials). In these three matters, as well as in our *Samayachara*, we should follow the lead of the elders and their example, because the injunctions in the Shastras may be varied or the Shastras may be silent on some points. To give a sure guidance to the followers of Varna-Asrama-Dharma in these matters, the authority and example of the elders in society is fixed upon as final and binding. If this lead is not followed, says the Shastra, he becomes a fallen man—a *Patita*. To those that say that internal *Dharma* or the *Dharma* of the mind is more important than external *Dharma* or *Bahya Achara* or purity, the answer is that the Hindu doctrine is just the reverse. The Shastras say that a man may follow any of the *Shad-Darsanas* for the satisfaction of his enquiring Soul or *Atman*, but by his *Bahya-Achara*, he must show to what section of the community he belongs, by his Sikha and Pundra. It is held also that *Bahya-Achara* is very essential for the purification of the mind and the preparation of the body for the study of the Vedanta and for the spiritual progress of the *Atman* through the prescribed *Samskaras*. Those who argue that external *Achara* has nothing to do with internal purity forget the close interaction between body and spirit. When in very ordinary experience of life, we see that the mood of one, say, the mood which produces laughter or anger for instance, produces a like response in the mind of another, who is opposite, and causes a similar mood or similar expression in him, can we not see at once the connection that exists between the mind and the body? Similarly, the external *Achara*, which, as it were, places the body in a certain condition considered to be most fitted for its spiritual training internally, is found to be quite an essential condition for internal purity. The argument that mental purity does not require or make essential the purity and the preparation of the body for spiritual training is quite opposed to reason as well as experience. *Samskara* known as *Chaula*, done in accordance with the Shastras, is thus an essential stage in the advancement of a child born within the fold of Varna-Asrama-Dharma.

The next great *Samskara*, perhaps the greatest, for one born in the fold of Varna-Asrama-Dharma, of the three Varnas,—Brahma, Kshatriya and Vaisya—is *Upanayana*, or the taking of the child to the Preacher of the Word, the Initiator of the child in the Gayatri, the Mantra, which is

the first and the foremost of all Mantras.

Every Mantra that is uttered by a follower of Varna-Asrama-Dharma, has a power or *Sakti* of its own. Every Mantra uttered at the proper time and in the proper way has a power of its own to achieve the results that have been set forth against them by those who have known the Truth and realised the power of the Mantras. The sound is first in origin and the meaning follows the sound. The purpose of every *Sastra* is distinct and is based on the arrangement of sounds in a particular way. In the *Sangeeta Sastra*, for example, one Raga known as the *Amrita Varshini Raga* is known to have the power of producing rain, when sung properly at the proper time. It is within human experience that two musical instruments placed in the same *Sruti* produce the same sound, when only one of the two is played upon by the musician. Similarly, a similarity in the adjustment of the vibration of sounds at two distant centres, has the power of simultaneous communication of an idea at both the places, as for instance, in wireless telegraphy. Various similar experiments and experiences of men go to show conclusively that *sound* has great *power*, when uttered at the proper time and in the proper way.

(*To be continued.*)

Dharma—V.

(By K. G. NATESA SASTRI, Vaidya Visarad.)

Let us now listen to what each school of thought, mentioned last time, has to say in regard to the principles which makes a *Pramana* admissible as being *valid*. First comes a section of "Sat-karya Vada" school which maintains as follows:—"It is true that "Bodhakatva" or "the ability to impart knowledge" must be the *criterion* on which a Pramana must be made to rest; but at the same time we contend that that alone is not sufficient, for both "Validity" as well as "Invalidity" become known of themselves or स्वतः as it is called. How? Because it is a law of Nature that all things derive their powers inherently from Nature. A cork floats on water because it is lighter than water. But why should the cork be so light? The answer will be "because it is its nature". No human effort will, or is known to have, ever been able to make it as heavy as a "stone" or "*Lead*". This is what the Mimamsakas mean when they say "स्वयमसदात्मनो देवैरपि तादात्म्यापत्तेः कर्तुमशक्यत्वात्" According, therefore to this principle it must be admitted that knowledge imparted to us by any Pramana must be both *Valid* as well as *Invalid*. For according to the law enunciated above a knowledge cannot be afterwards made *Valid* if it were *Invalid* before and *vice versa*. Hence concludes triumphantly the first school thus:—सर्वकारणानां स्वकार्यशक्तेः स्वाभाविकत्वात् उभयमपि ज्ञानस्य स्वरसादवगम्यते" इति which means "Every *Cause* has by *nature* derived its power of producing or creating an *Effect*. Hence ज्ञान or knowledge also must be presumed to have the power of becoming both as well." The other school which was till now patiently hearing all this could no longer contain itself and retorts thus:—"It is absurd to hold that knowledge exhibits simultaneously both validity and *invalidity* in regard to its own existence." The existence, for example, of a tree in front of us is brought to our knowledge by the eyes falling on it and carrying the impressions thus created to the brain which sensation makes us know that there is a tree before us. But the knowledge imparted thus by Perception cannot become both *valid* as well as *invalid*. For what is *Pramanya* or validity? It is the reverse of *Apramanya* or invalidity, Then how can a knowledge become one thing and at the same time become the reverse of it. Says Parthasarathi:—'न हि ज्ञानं स्वविषयस्य तथात्वं अतथात्वं च युगपच्छक्नोति वेदयितुं; विरोधात् ॥" To this the first school replies "we do not hold that every Pramana becomes Valid and Invalid at the same time; what we mean is that certain knowledge becomes of itself Pramana at the outset while others become similarly अप्रमाण". In reply to this it is contended that it cannot be so, for there is no other instrument with which we can test which knowledge is *Valid* at the outset and which is not. We have been supplied only with the knowledge of a certain thing. What else is there to test whether it falls under the head of those that become Pramana at the outset or not. Hence it must be admitted that knowledge at the outset becomes neither *Pramana*, nor *Apramana*, but simply remains without any *attributes* or qualifications. It is only then that we can ascertain whether it is valid or not according as

the source is pure or contaminated. This view is expressed thus :— "अतो द्वयमपि स्वस्वभावेनानिरूपितं कारणगुणदोषज्ञानाभ्यामवगम्यत इत्यपरे' The Buddhists now step forward and eloquently deny the statement that knowledge is without any attribute in the begining. Say the Buddhists "एवं हि गुणदोषावधारणात् प्रागन्यतरेणाप्याकारेण अर्थमनवगमयद्विज्ञानं निःस्वभावं स्यात्। तस्मादप्रामाण्यं स्वतः; प्रामाण्यं तु संवादज्ञानादिभिरित्येतदेव युक्तम्' इति। The passage means :—This theory keeps knowledge without any qualifications before it is ascertained from an examination of the source and finding out whether the source is good or bad; That is to say knowledge becomes निःस्वभावः This cannot be maintained and hence it must be held that *Apramanya* becomes of itself known at first while *Pramanya* becomes known when the source is found to be good or when we get corroborative evidences." Let us try to understand this at some length. What the Buddhists mean is this: The real *criterion* for a thing to become *Valid* or *Pramana* is that the instruments with which we recognise the existence of a certain thing must be pure and free from all blemishes. Mere possession of knowledge alone is not sufficient, for such a knowledge we get even in dreams and if we are to hold that knowledge alone is enough to make a Pramana valid, we will be surely launched into the ridiculous position of having to accept the phantoms of a dream as real. स्वप्नज्ञान or the knowledge we obtain in Swapna or Dream is as much a knowledge as that which we have when we are awake and as such must be accepted as giving us a real view of the thing. Hence it is sheer nonsense to maintain that knowledge alone, irrespective of the worth of its source, is a sufficient basis for a true Pramana. Moreover what is *Apramanya* or *Invalidity* ? It is the mere negation of *Pramanya* or *Validity*. Hence it need not require an instrument or an agent to make it known. And what is negation ? It means the non-existence *Pramanya*. In other words what we mean by Pramanya has not come into existence. Now for a thing to be perceptible whether it be to the eye or the mind, it must have form or shape which can be grasped, either by the eye or by the mind or by any other of the senses. Therefore it is we hold that *Pramanya* is वस्तु or that which can be grasped while *Apramanya* is अवस्तु or that which cannot be grasped. It is well known that man grasps a certain thing only when there are the requisite instruments which help him in the process; Otherwise his mind is blank. Hence it is we say that *Apramanya* requires no proof to show its non-existence. In other words *Apramanya* becomes known of itself at the outset while *Pramanya* must be demonstrated with the help of proper instruments of knowledge. There is another reason why *Apramanya* must be held to be known of itself at the outset. It is well known that when an object such as an oyster or some such thing lies in front of us our eyes carry the impression through the sensory nerves to the seat of knowledge in the brain when we start and discern that there is the mother-of-pearl in front of us; but it is equally well known that these impressions make us mistake this mother-of-pearl for real silver. Hence it is absolutely necessary that we must first ascertain by a thorough examination of the sources of knowledge, that is, our eyes in the present case, whether what we see before us is the real mother-of-pearl or the unreal silver. For what guarantee is there that our eyes are not misleading. If, as you say, knowledge is a sufficient proof of the validity of apramana, then the knowledge that what is in front of you is silver must hold good; But what harm ? No harm, only you will be the lord of the region of blissful ignorance. But, asks the Mimamsaka, what is your standard of a *Pramana* ?

Two Hindu Plays.

(By P. R. Krishnaswami, M.A.)

The Madras Secretariat Harikatha Party has laid the public of Kumbakonam under a debt of gratitude for its successful renderings on the stage of two of the most popular Hindu plays on the 23rd and 24th February. The motive of the Party was of the loftiest. The performances were in aid of the Ramakrishna Mission Students' Home in Madras. There can be nothing nobler and more truly patriotic than this kind of effort to advance the cause of education in this country. Men who wish to serve their motherland do not need to speak from housetops about patriotism. They do not even need to provoke enemies and persevere in hostilities towards

them. The cause of the motherland is sacred and as such cannot warrant for its means anything that is violent. The best part of a sacred service is in hard, quiet, persevering work. That the clerks and officers of a Government office could so well advance the cause of the Ramakrishna Mission Home for Students is a proof that genuine patriotism is not a monopoly of the politicians.

Apart from the laudable motive which prompted the staging of the plays, the choice and performance of the plays were highly commendable. The subjects "Nandanar," and "Paduka Pattabhishekam" typify the Hindu religiosity which governs the Hindu stage as it governs every other aspect of Hindu life. But it will be foolish not to perceive the artistic possibilities of these stories on the stage. "Nandanar" as it is presented on the stage rather varies from the story as *originally* narrated. The path of his progress from his Pariah birth to being one of God's chosen devotees was beset with less of persecution than is represented on the modern Indian stage. The whole story of "Nandanar" shows a *pitfall* in the actual working of the system—the possible growth of narrow class feelings among the different members of the system. But the *truth* is that as far as God's favour is concerned, birth in any caste may equally qualify to win it. To every man the path of earthly Duty is fixed in his caste. There is just another Hindu drama where reflections on the principles of caste distinction are suggested. Harischandra is degraded to a chandala and holds his position in the cremation ground. Personally it is a mortal degradation to him, but Harischandra is not slow in striving to discharge in strictest correctness the duties of his new place. When Chandramati cannot pay the usual fee to the keeper of the cremation ground for her own dead child, Harischandra has enough nerves in him to slay her.

The story of the pariah of Adanoor illustrates vividly the sort of feudal old-world relations that existed between the Brahmins and the Pariahs, traditionally the highest and lowest in the caste system. The wide gulf between, and the untouchable "depressed" state, we hear of at the present day cannot have been in the old world in which Nandan lived. The Brahmin owned the land and his pariah servants cultivated it for him. But the tie between the owner and the cultivator should have been one of secure friendliness, if not of affection. The interests of the pariah cultivator are the interests of the Brahmin owner and both of them could not prosper in the world without the keenest friendly concern for each other's welfare. The injury to this healthy solidarity in the caste system is of modern growth—due partly to the absorption of a reckless lawless competitive principle from the West and to hostile propaganda from quarters where the significance of the caste-system was not correctly grasped. In the story of Nandanar the pariahs are repeatedly at the Brahmin's home. They complain of Nandan's unusual practices. In another place the Brahmin speaks of Nandan as indispensable in his fields and would even flatter him that his touch alone would transform the corn into the ripe gold of the harvest.

In the drama Nanda and his Brahmin master are pitted against each other, the one in continuous, meek, supplication while the other, haughty, and bigoted, scorns and despises his pretensions. And then God intervenes and performs a miracle. The harvest in the Brahmin's fields is ready long before any one could expect it. This was the only means for Nandan to get his master's permission to go to Chidambaram. The miracle amazes and delights him. The Brahmin is instantly converted by the divine act. He is filled with unspeakable remorse and begs for Nandan's pardon. But the meek Nandan can have harboured no spite against his master. He is on the other hand full of infinite gratitude to him who had been his protector from child-hood. The Brahmin's remorse, the esteem and the affection which are aroused in him by the saintliness of Nanda, and the unassuming peaceful temper of Nanda, render the scene most touching.

(*To be continued*)

Our Social Problem and the Bhagavad Gita By K. S. Ramaswamy Sastri B.A., B.L.
Price Annas 4 only.

Printed and Published by T. K. Balasubrahmanya Aiyar B.A. at the Sri Vani Vilas Press, Srirangam.